

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended for purposes of clarification, i.e., to state what the layers of material of different refractive indices actually achieve. Claim 4 has been amended to delete the "adapted" phrase. Claim 8 has also been amended to delete the "adapted" phrase, thereby to overcome the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 9 has been amended to correct numerical values.

The claims presently under active prosecution in this application are claims 1-3 and 6-9.

The rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakanishi is traversed, as are the rejections of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

It is submitted that the Examiner has misinterpreted Nakanishi in light of applicant's disclosure instead of interpreting the reference independently, on its own terms, as required for a valid rejection.

Nakanishi does not disclose, teach or suggest a conductive article having its conductive component outermost. The conductive components 14 and 18 of Nakanishi are buried within the interior of the article in all disclosed embodiments.

There is no suggestion whatever in Nakanishi that components 11,12,13,14 could be removed from or serve a useful purpose outside of the article as a whole.

Nakanishi does not disclose, teach or suggest an article having, in sequence, a substrate, a high refractive index layer, a low refractive index layer and a high

refractive index layer as claimed by applicant. Nakanishi teaches the opposite. In column 3, lines 22-24, he refers to a five layered structure of low refractive index SiO_2 and high refractive index TiO_2 , that is, low-high-low-high-low. Again, at column 5, line 33, he refers to a "five-layered structure of SiO_2 and TiO_2 ", and in lines 36-37, he calls for "a three-layered structure or a seven-layered structure formed by repetition of SiO_2 and TiO_2 layers..." In Nakanishi, the layers always appear in that order: low-high-low. Applicant calls for high-low-high in claim 1 and high-low-high-low in claim 6. Nakanishi does not meet the claimed structure.

As pointed out above, the conductive elements 14 and 18 of Nakanishi are not outermost, and therefore are not available for direct electrical contact as called for in claim 1.

Further, and most significantly, Nakanishi contains no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of utilizing the layers of materials of high and low refractive index to optically match the refractive indices of the layer of conductive material and the substrate. Not one word about optical matching appears in Nakanishi.

Claim 1, and therefore all the claims under active prosecution, distinguish clearly and patentably over Nakanishi. Nakanishi neither anticipates under Section 102 nor renders obvious under Section 103, neither alone nor in combination with Biro et al. Biro does not supply any of the above-discussed limitations that distinguish the present invention over Nakanishi.

As to claim 8, Nakanishi does not disclose that his article is adapted to be used with the conductive layer exposed to air. The conductive layers 14 and 18 are


buried within the interior of the article. In all cases, the exposed exterior surfaces of the article are substrate 11, hardcoat 19, antireflective structures 23 and 24, and/or adhesive 34.

Nakanishi simply does not teach or suggest a conductive article having its conductive component outermost. That is applicant's invention.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 1-3 and 6-9 distinguish clearly and patentably over the cited references and should be found allowable, and that, upon indication of the allowability of generic claim 1, 2 or 3, non-elected species claims 4 and 5 should also be found allowable.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas R. Juettner
Reg. No. 16,158
Phone (619) 234-1130

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606

Fax (312) 360-9315